DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 325 642 CE 056 166

AUTHOR Munn, Pamela; MacDonald, Carolyn
TITLE Adult Participation in Education and Training. Practitioner Minipaper 4. SCRE Publication 100.
INSTITUTION Scottish Council for Research in Education.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-947833-26-9
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 68p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; *Adults; Attitude Measures; *Continuing Education; *Educational Attitudes; Educational Research; Foreign Countries; Individual Characteristics; *Participant Characteristics; *Participation; Postsecondary Education
IDENTIFIERS *Scotland

ABSTRACT

Interviews with 1,826 adults in Scotland sought to determine their attitudes toward returning to education and training, purposes of and factors affecting participation, and future demand for education. Findings included the following: (1) 42% had returned to education and training, almost half to courses lasting 6 or more months; (2) almost three-quarters of managerial/professional persons had participated, but 77% of semi/unskilled workers had not; (3) reasons for nonparticipation included lack of interest/time, family responsibilities, and lack of job relevance; (4) job relatedness, improved qualifications, and personal satisfaction were reasons for participation; and (5) lack of interest in participation may stem from negative school experiences. Conclusions and recommendations included the following: (1) more efforts to encourage participation of semi/unskilled workers and adults under 35 are needed; (2) the utility and benefits of education and training and their distinction from prior school experiences should be stressed; (3) additional services such as day care should be provided; (4) distance learning opportunities and the diversity of adult education courses should be advertised; and (5) a wide variety of part-time and evening courses should be offered. (The survey questionnaire, weighted and unweighted sample profile, and 24 references are included.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Practitioner MiniPaper

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED325642

ADULT PARTICIPATION IN EDUCATION AND TRAINING

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. Tuijnman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Pamela Munn/Carolyn MacDonald

CE

ADULT PARTICIPATION IN EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Pamela Munn
and
Carolyn MacDonald

The Scottish Council for Research in Education

SCRE Publication 100
Practitioner MiniPaper 4

Series Editors: Sally Brown and Rosemary Wake

ISBN 0 947833 26 9

Copyright © 1988 The Scottish Council for Research in Education

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Printed and bound in Great Britain for the Scottish Council for Research in Education, 15 St John Street, Edinburgh EH8 8JR, by Russell Print, 14 Forrest Street, Blantyre, Glasgow G72 0JP.

CONTENTS

		page
List of Tables		ii
Preface		iii
1	**Background**	1
2	**Fundamental Factors affecting Adult Population in Education and Training**	8
	The extent of adult participation in education and training in Scotland	8
	Factors affecting participation	11
	Policy implications	16
3	**Subsidiary Factors affecting Return to Education and Training**	19
	The wide range of subsidiary factors affecting return	20
	Knowledge of educational and training opportunities	23
	Policy implications	27
4	**Future Demand for Adult Education and Training**	29
	The extent of future demand	29
	What kinds of courses are in demand?	33
	Potential returners	39
	Policy implications	43
5	**Policy Implications of the Research: an overview**	45
References		49
Appendices		
	Appendix A: Survey Questionnaire	51
	Appendix B: Scottish Opinion Survey – Sample Profile (weighted)	58
	Appendix C: Scottish Opinion Survey – Sample Profile (unweighted)	59

TABLES

		page
2.1	Extent of adult participation	9
2.2	Length of participation in courses	10
2.3	Returners and non-returners by social class	11
2.4	Most important reasons for non-participation	12
2.5	Most important reasons for participation	13
2.6	Purposes of return	13
2.7	Educational qualifications of returners and non-returners	15
2.8	Age of completion of initial full-time education	15
3.1	Subsidiary reasons for non-participation	20
3.2	Subsidiary reasons for participation	22
3.3	Knowledge of local education and training opportunities	23
3.4	Awareness of distance learning opportunities	25
3.5	Knowledge about providers of education and training	26
4.1	Characteristics of those intending to take courses in the future	30
4.2	Future intentions of returners	32
4.3	Subjects in demand	34
4.4	The purposes of future return	35
4.5	Preferred mode of attendance	36
4.6	The demand for certification	37
4.7	The demand for certification by course	38
4.8	Characteristics of potential returners	40
4.9	Most important factors affecting participation: potential returners and non-returners	41
4.10	Educational experience of returners, potential returners and non-returners	42

PREFACE

In 1982, the Advisory Council for Adult and Continuing Education (ACACE), published a useful and important report on adults' educational experience and needs. The study, however, concerned only England and Wales. There was no similar study in Scotland. Whether the findings of the ACACE study could be applied to Scotland was an open question given the different educational system and traditions in Scotland. While the study reported here is not a precise replica of the ACACE research, it had broadly similar aims. These were to discover the extent of adult participation in education and training and the factors affecting such participation. This report, however, is only one aspect of a larger project designed to address these aims in a variety of ways. The project includes case-studies and smaller surveys of specific groups as well as the survey of a sample of the general adult population which is the focus of this report. As a whole it comprises a three year study and was commissioned by the Scottish Education Department (SED) in 1986.

The report has five chapters. Chapter 1 concerns the background to the research, containing information about the research questions, the sample and, crucially, what we meant by adult participation in education and training. Chapter 2 concentrates on the extent of participation in education and training and on what we have called fundamental factors affecting that participation. Chapter 3 reports subsidiary factors affecting participation and draws particular attention to the lack of knowledge of the opportunities available to adults. Chapter 4 looks at future demand, stressing how difficult this is to estimate. It identifies a group of adults, whom we have called potential returners, who are of particular interest. At the end of each of these chapters, we identify the policy implications of our findings. An overview of these policy implications is presented in Chapter 5 where attention is drawn to the Cinderella status of adult education and training until the recent past.

Many people have contributed to this report. We wish to acknowledge in particular the help of Chris Eynon of System 3 who carried out the survey for us. His unfailing courtesy, patience and constructive criticism were very much appreciated. Similarly, Professor C V Brown, Stirling University, made helpful comments

on the wording and layout of questions, asking us very pertinent questions about analysis. We also wish to acknowledge the support and advice of our Advisory Committee who commented on successive drafts of the questionnaire. SED permitted the questionnaire to be wider ranging than originally envisaged by making additional funds available. Finally, of course, we wish to thank all the people who participated in the survey. Janette Finlay typed successive drafts of this report quickly and accurately and we appreciate her expert help. Errors of commission or of omission rest with the authors. The views expressed here are not necessarily those either of the Scottish Education Department or of the Scottish Council for Research in Education.

Pamela Munn
Carolyn MacDonald

CHAPTER 1

BACKGROUND

Aims of the research

In 1986, the Scottish Education Department (SED), commissioned research on 'Opportunities for Mature Students'. The decision to commission research grew out of a number of labour market concerns. Two of these concerns provide the background to the research reported here. These are:

- Scotland needed a flexible and adaptable workforce to generate and sustain economic growth
- Recurrent education and training were a means to that end.

In Scotland, little was known about the general population's participation in, or attitudes to, returning to education and training. Despite the 12,000 items listed in the research bibliography computer bank held by the National Institute for the Continuing Education of Adults, the only recent survey of the general adult population was that undertaken by ACACE in 1982. This survey did not include Scotland. Our own perusal of recent work on adult education and training suggested that much of the literature concerned particular groups of adults undertaking particular courses of study. General surveys of adults' attitudes to returning to education and training were thin on the ground. These particularistic studies were important to us in designing our own survey, however. The work of Horobin, Branscombe and Evetts (1987), Jones and Williams (1979), Houle (1979), and Squires (1981), for instance, as well as the ACACE study, have made our own work possible by identifying the areas in which our own survey should concentrate.

Given the labour market concerns mentioned above and the lack of previous large scale survey work in Scotland on adult education and training, our research had three main aims. These were:

i. to map the extent of participation in adult education and training in Scotland
ii. to explore the factors affecting participation identified by previous research
iii. to estimate the future demand for education and training.

Before we could proceed with the research, however, we had to be clear about what we meant by adult participation in education and training.

Who counts as an adult returner?

One of the characteristics of the particularistic studies mentioned above, is that researchers did not have to struggle with questions of definitions. In most cases, mature students were taken to be those who met the criteria of 'maturity' specified by the institution or course being studied. In Scotland there is considerable variety amongst institutions in ages which define a mature student. The SED, on the other hand, defines a mature student as someone aged 25 or over for grant purposes. The ACACE (1982) study counted all people aged 17–75 as adults.

We believed it was important to specify a minimum age. More importantly, though, we wanted to include the idea of *returning* to education and training. This was essential if we wished to make claims about the extent and nature of 'mature student' participation. Thus we wished to differentiate between those who continued their education from school to college or university without a break, and those who had had a break. Indeed the term *adult returner* more adequately captures the eventual focus of the research than the term 'mature student'. 'Mature student' is a term that typically conjures up a person in full time higher education and our focus was wider than this. Our explanation of what counted as education and training is given below. For the moment, however, our interest is in who counts as an adult returner.

For us, an adult returner was someone aged 20 or over, who had had a break of at least two years from their initial full-time education. Inevitably the selection of a minimum age and of the length of the break from initial full-time education were somewhat arbitrary.

We chose 20 as the minimum age for two main reasons. Our starting point was that the statutory end of compulsory schooling was 16. There is now, however, substantial provision of full-time education and training for 16–18 year olds. The two year Youth Training Scheme as well as the more traditional further and higher education provision mop up high proportions of this age group. Latest figures show (SED, 1986), that over 50% of 16 year olds are in what we would call initial full-time education. Indeed 16–18 year olds are already the focus of a good deal of research, for instance, through the Scottish School Leavers' Survey, and we had

no wish to duplicate research being done elsewhere. Our second reason for choosing 20 as the minimum age was that it conformed to a common sense view of returner: someone who has resumed education and training after some years' experience as an adult. The age of 20 provides for a two year gap between reaching adulthood – 18 is the age of majority – and any subsequent return to education and training.

We had two main reasons, too, for specifying a two year break from initial full-time education. Firstly, many educational institutions operate deferred entry schemes, whereby school leavers can take a one year break between school and entry to college or university. We felt that students who had taken this option should not be regarded as returners. Secondly, we suspected that after a two year break from initial full-time education, adults became further removed from both habits of study and familiar sources of information and guidance about educational opportunities and the rules and regulations governing admissions procedures.

We are aware that our definition may exclude some participants in adult education. For instance, someone who is doing postgraduate work as part of their initial full-time education and who is also taking an evening class in an unrelated subject is participating in adult education but would not be included in our target population. Similarly, the substantial minority of youngsters under the age of 20 who had not been involved in any continuous provision after leaving school would also be excluded from our target population.

What counts as education and training?

We believed it was misguided to try to differentiate between educational courses on the one hand and vocational courses on the other. Previous work had shown that the motivation of individuals undertaking the same course might be very different and indeed that an individual's purpose in doing a course could change and develop while on a particular course (Norris, 1985). What *was* important was whether the individuals concerned perceived their return to education and training as 'vocational' and/or as 'educational'. These terms were translated into categories such as 'job related' and 'personal interest' when we asked about the purpose of returning.

In order to obtain a picture of the broad range of courses attended by adult returners, we adopted a wide definition of an education or training course. This was:

> any course or systematic programme of learning which lasts for a total of 7 hours or more, within a three month period.

Again, the specified length of courses was somewhat arbitrary. Given the origins of the research in labour market concerns, however, we were anxious not to exclude short courses, which had been shown to be preferred by employers (Cosgrove, 1984). Thus our operational definition of education and training encompassed a wide range of courses. Full-time, part-time, advanced, non-advanced, open and distance learning, work-based training, access and study skills and certificated and non-certificated courses were all included.

It will be seen from our interview schedule, Appendix A, that our conceptualisations of both an adult returner and of education and training were difficult to translate into clear, unambiguous questions. Our pilot work convinced us, however, that the questions appeared more difficult on paper than in face to face interview. Our random data checks subsequently confirmed this.

To help us to decide more precisely on the areas to be covered in the survey we elaborated our research aims into a series of research questions. These are given below.

The research questions

The overall aims of the study were to obtain a picture of the extent of adult participation in education and training, of the factors affecting participation and of the likely future demand. These aims were formulated into the following research questions:

First, on the extent of participation:

- How many adults have and have not returned to education and training?

- Can returners and non-returners be differentiated in terms of age, sex, class and previous educational experience?

Beyond these general research questions on the extent of participation, there were five others directed specifically at those who had returned:

- For what purposes did they return?

- What mode of attendance was used?

- How long do returners return for?

– How is returning financed?

– Does returning result in qualifications?

Secondly, on factors affecting participation:

– What are the factors affecting adults' participation or lack of participation in education and training? In particular do they know about the education and training opportunities available to them?

Potential factors were identified from previous research and this generated one list for returners and another list for non-returners.

Thirdly, on future demand:

– What kinds of courses would adults be attracted towards in the future? In particular are preferences for subject content, mode of attendance and certification expressed?

– For what purposes would adults like to return?

These broad research questions were translated largely into closed interview questions with categories of response being drawn from the literature. The questionnaire itself is included as Appendix A.

The interview schedule was designed and piloted by us. It was administered by System Three Scotland, however, as part of their monthly Omnibus Survey in February and March 1987, giving a total sample of roughly 2,000. Sample details are given below. System Three also carried out an initial routine technical analysis of the data from the survey. This analysis has been refined and interpreted by us.

The sample

As already stated, the fieldwork was undertaken by System Three Scotland who collected the data during their monthly Omnibus Survey, the Scottish Opinion Survey. Our questions, which we had piloted among a small sample in December 1986 and January 1987, were added to this survey and appeared as the second section, following a short series of questions on voting intentions.

The sample for the Scottish Opinion Survey covers up to 40 constituencies throughout mainland Scotland, with sampling points

selected each month to be representative in terms of broad geographical location (north, east and west) and party of MP. Within each sampling point, interviewers are given a random route to select households (a random starting point and fixed sampling interval) and quotas of working and non-working men and women to ensure a representative age, class and sex spread. (Class is determined by head of household's occupation.) All interviewing is carried out in the respondent's own home and only one interview per household is done. Naturally, System Three have a pool of trained interviewers who carry out the fieldwork. It is perhaps worth adding that we helped construct the interviewers' instructions for our part of the survey.

Because we wanted a sample of more than a thousand adults, data was collected over a period of 2 months – February and March 1987. A total of 1,896 adults aged 20 years or over were interviewed in the course of the two stages, details of which are shown below:

Fieldwork dates	*Number of sampling points*	*Sample achieved*
19–24 February	38	935
26–31 March	39	961

To ensure that the sample was representative of the adult population in terms of age, sex and class, it was weighted to match JICNARS population estimates from the National Readership Survey of January–December 1983. As a result of the weighting techniques employed, the effective sample size was reduced marginally from 1,896 to 1,881. Sample profiles, both unweighted and weighted, are shown in Appendices B and C.

A small proportion of the sample (just under 3%) did not meet our criteria for inclusion in the possible returner population, either because they had not completed their initial full-time education or had not had a two year gap since doing so. This was particularly the case for 20–24 age group. In all, 18% of those interviewed in this age group were eliminated from our sample on these grounds. It is important to bear this in mind when we discuss our findings about the extent of participation in education and training of particular age groups. This meant that out effective sample size (weighted) was reduced to 1,826.

Claims of the research

Our sampling procedure allows us to make generalisations about the general adult population in Scotland in terms of answers to our

research questions. Where numbers make generalisation suspect, as for instance in the purposes allocated to studying specific courses, we have drawn attention to this. Similarly, where we feel the data are unreliable because of the question(s) asked, we have indicated this. This applies most clearly to the data regarding future intentions, where respondents may give what they feel is a socially acceptable answer rather than their 'real' intention. We have tried to produce 'harder' figures on future demand by referring to potential returners in Chapter 4. These are adults who have made enquiries about courses in the past but who have not yet returned to education and training.

The research is essentially descriptive, testing out hypotheses about factors affecting return which other researchers have identified. In that sense, much of what is reported here is unsurprising, in that it confirms many of the things we suspected about returners, potential returners and non-returners. It does represent, however, the first large-scale attempt to collect Scottish data on these matters. The data have been extremely useful in refining hypotheses for other aspects of our work.

The main distinctively Scottish feature of the data is the smaller future demand for education and training than in England and Wales (ACACE, 1982). This is discussed in more detail in Chapter 4. Our data also suggest a dominant perception of adult education and training as evening classes done at further education colleges. We should draw attention to the fact that in this context we may have under-represented the extent of 'in-company' training. Although our interview schedule did mention 'place of work' as a provider of education and training, we had no specific question on in-company training. We are following this up in a complementary study of those who have returned to education and training and we will report on it in due course.

The report of our findings broadly follows the three main aims of the research we gave at the beginning of this chapter. Chapter 2 reports the extent of participation in education and training and highlights what we have called fundamental factors affecting participation. It is to this we now turn.

CHAPTER 2

FUNDAMENTAL FACTORS AFFECTING ADULT PARTICIPATION IN EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Introduction

What makes adults return to education and training? This was the key question for a research project derived from labour policy concerns. Starting from a premise that Scotland needs a flexible and adaptable workforce, the assumption was that education and training were a means to this end. If research could uncover the factors affecting adult participation in education and training, then it could inform policy in this area. The ultimate policy aim would be to increase participation rates in education and training, thus supplying Britain with the flexible workforce it needed.

There are clearly many factors potentially affecting return to education and training. For those in work, a major factor might be the attitudes of employers. More generally, attitudes of providers are also important. We should make it clear that the research reported here concerns the views of the general population. Views of employers and of providers of education and training are being collected and we will report on these in due course.

As we indicated in Chapter 1, remarkably little is known about attitudes in Scotland towards returning to education and training. Our survey drew on a broadly comparable study done in England and Wales (ACACE 1982), and on a range of smaller studies in various parts of the UK. We were thus essentially exploring whether the factors identified in these previous studies were important in Scotland too.

We report our data in this chapter under three main headings. First, we consider the extent of adult participation in education and training in Scotland. Secondly, we identify the dominant factors affecting participation. Lastly, we look at the policy implications of the data.

The extent of adult participation in education and training in Scotland

In order to count as an adult returner to education and training our respondents had to meet three criteria:

- they had to be aged 20 or over
- they had to have at least a 2 year break from initial full-time education (this included college or university if they had attended within 2 years of leaving school)
- their return to education and training had to last for at least seven hours within a three month period.

A fuller explanation of our definition of adult returner and of education and training is given in Chapter 1.

The extent of adult participation in education and training is shown in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1: Extent of Adult Participation

	Total Sample N = 1826 %	Adult Non-Returners N = 1061 %	Adult Returners N = 765 %
Men	46	44	50
Women	54	56	50

The overall extent of participation was 42% (a total of 765 returners), made up of equal proportions of men and women.

At first sight this looks broadly encouraging. A figure of 42% reveals that a sizeable proportion of adults in Scotland has been motivated at some time or other to return to education and training. It could be argued, however, that our definition of education and training was so broad that we are presenting an over-optimistic picture of the extent of participation. In other words, we were capturing a large number of adults who had returned only for seven hours. This was not the case: Table 2.2 shows that 47% of returners participated in courses lasting six months or more.

Table 2.2: Length of Participation in Courses

	Total N=765 %	Men N=382 %	Women N=383 %
Less than 4 weeks	17	26	8
4–10 weeks	15	14	16
11 weeks–under 6 months	19	13	25
6 months–1 year	24	16	31
More than a year	23	29	17
Don't know	1	1	2

There are some striking differences between men and women here. Broadly speaking, men seem to attend either very short courses or courses lasting more than a year. Women's attendance at short courses is very sparse. They attend courses in the 11 weeks – 1 year bands at about twice the rate of men. Such differences may not be the result of personal preferences, but rather due to the differing circumstances in which men and women find themselves. Our data on the purposes for which returners return to education and training show that vocational purposes are dominant for men, with employers sponsoring return. Women were more likely to be in part-time employment and so less likely to have their return to education and training sponsored by employers (EOC, 1987; TUC, 1987; UNESCO, 1987). Even women in full-time employment are less likely to be given paid educational leave (Bryant and Titmus, 1981). Our data also reveal that more women than men return for personal interest, and this too could help to explain the differential participation rates. Table 2.2 is, therefore, not so surprising.

To return to the extent of participation, the data so far present us with quite an encouraging picture. Over 40% of adults have returned to education and training and almost half of that 40% returned to courses lasting six months or more. It is when we compare the social class of returners and non-returners that the picture begins to look less encouraging. Table 2.3 shows the extent of return in social class terms using the IPA (Institute of Practitioners in Advertising) social class definitions. Under this categorisation, AB denote higher or intermediate professional, managerial or administrative occupations, C1 denotes supervisory or clerical and junior managerial, administrative or professional

occupations, C2 covers skilled manual workers and DE represents semi- or unskilled manual workers and the long-term unemployed.

Table 2.3: Returners and Non-Returners by Social Class

	ALL	AB	C1	C2	DE
N=	1826	272	365	532	657
	%	%	%	%	%
Returners	42	74	56	39	23
Non-Returners	58	26	44	61	77

The social class differences are immediately apparent. Almost three quarters of ABs have returned to education and training. More than three quarters of DEs have not. This finding is in line with many other studies e.g. ACACE (1982), McIntosh (1976) and NIAE (1970). Horobin (1987) points out that the social class composition of Scotland is different from that of England and Wales, with Scotland having a larger proportion of its population in social classes DE. Our data are therefore not strictly comparable with the England and Wales studies. Whatever the technicalities of direct comparison, no one concerned with adult participation in education and training can be happy that over three quarters of those in social class DE have not returned to education and training.

So far, we have examined the extent of adult participation in education and training. We have stressed the fairly high participation rate of 42% but have drawn attention to the differing rates of participation amongst social classes. In particular we have highlighted the lack of participation by over 75% of the DE group. We now turn to the factors affecting partcipation.

Factors affecting participation

We recognised from the outset that it is extremely difficult to explain why one is not interested in something. We therefore approached the question of factors in three main ways. First, we presented returners and non-returners with a list of possible reasons for their return or non-return and asked them to choose reasons which applied to them. Questions 14, 15, 17 and 18 on the schedule in Appendix A deal with this. Secondly, we asked returners about the purposes of their return. (Question 13 on the schedule.) Lastly, we collected data on the educational experience

of all our sample. This largely consisted of questions about educational qualifications and about the age when initial full-time education was completed. (Questions 4, 5 and 28 on the schedule.) All these questions were derived from previous research mentioned in Chapter 1. We hope that our case-study work with returners and with non-returners will enrich the data we report here.

Table 2.4 gives the reasons cited by non-returners as the most important for their lack of participation in education and training.

Table 2.4: Most Important Reasons for Non-Participation

	Total N=1061 %	Men N=464 %	Women N=597 %
Not really interested	28	29	27
Haven't got the time	16	17	16
Have to look after children/dependents	13	1	22
Wouldn't help in a job	8	12	5

Note: Five most important reasons only cited. Totals do not add up to 100.

This makes depressing reading for those committed to encouraging adult participation in education and training. The table indicates only one tangible way in which one group, women, might be encouraged to return. This is to provide creche or similar facilities for the 22% of women who cited having to look after children or other dependents as the most important reason for lack of participation. The predominant reasons, however, lack of interest and lack of time, suggest the need for a fundamental change in the perception of education and training. It is interesting that lack of use in a job should emerge amongst the four most frequently cited reasons for non-participation. Taken as a whole, the data here suggest a view of adult education and training as intrinsically uninteresting, not worth giving time to, and of little practical use or value. This view is in stark contrast to that held by returners.

Table 2.5: Most Important Reasons for Participation

	Total N=765 %	Men N=382 %	Women N=383 %
Thought it would help in my job	19	24	14
Subject interested me	17	12	23
Thought it would be useful to me	15	14	17
Wanted to improve my qualifications	10	12	9
Employer suggested it	9	14	4

Note: Five most important reasons only cited. Totals do not add up to 100.

The dominant reasons here are the usefulness of, and interest in, education and training. Usefulness in terms of jobs is seen even more strikingly when we look at the purposes of return identified by returners.

Table 2.6: Purposes of Return

	Total N=765 %	Men N=382 %	Women N=383 %
The job you were doing then	41	60	23
A job you hoped to get	17	19	15
Increasing your qualifications	19	20	17
Personal interests/hobbies	41	22	61
Unwaged work (housewife/voluntary)	1	–	1
Other	1	1	1
Don't know	–	–	–

Note: Respondents were able to give more than one answer and so the column totals exceed 100%.

Job-relatedness dominates the purposes of return, especially if one believes that qualifications are usually gained for their exchange value in the labour market as well as for personal satisfaction. There is some difference in the purpose of return in class terms. DEs are more likely to cite personal interests and less likely to cite vocational purposes than other groups. It is difficult to know whether this is an important difference. We have no data, as yet, on the working status of the different class groups at the time of their first return to education and training, and it is likely that purpose of return is associated with working status. We hope to have more to say about this in a future publication, concerned with returners' experiences of education and training.

It is also abundantly clear, however, that returning to education and training can be leisure related: 41% of respondents cited personal interest or hobby as a purpose of returning. Looking at the data as a whole, we can see that adults return to education and training for a variety of purposes. As we will see in Chapter 4, however, some groups return for specific purposes. It is evident from Table 2.6, for instance, that women are more likely than men to return for personal interests or hobbies. For the moment, however, our concern is with the striking contrast in the perceptions of education and training held by returners on the one hand and non-returners on the other. Why is the returners' view of education and training as useful, interesting and enjoyable, not shared by non-returners?

As we have already indicated, we hope our case-studies of returners and of non-returners will provide us with fuller answers to this question. What we can do at the moment is offer speculative answers based on the data we already have. It seemed plausible to us that if one had already experienced education and/or training as interesting, enjoyable and useful, then one was more likely to return to it. If, on the other hand, one had experienced education and/or training as boring, unenjoyable and useless, one would need a pretty big incentive to return.

Table 2.7 compares the educational qualifications of returners and non-returners. (We coded the highest level of qualifications only.) These are only one indicator, of course, of previous educational experience. For our purposes, 'intermediate' was defined as professional institute part examinations and 'advanced' as teacher training certificate, HNC/HND, degrees and above.

Table 2.7: Educational Qualifications of Returners and Non-Returners

	Total Sample N=1826 %	Non-Returners N=1061 %	Returners N=765 %
None	43	57	22
Less than 5 'O' grades	20	17	24
5 or more 'O' grades	7	5	11
Apprenticeship	9	7	10
Intermediate	2	1	3
Highers/'A' levels	6	4	10
Advanced	9	4	15
Other/Don't know	5	6	5

Non-returners were less well qualified than returners in all categories of qualifications (with the exception of Other/Don't know). It is particularly noticeable that 57% of non-returners had no qualifications compared with 22% of returners. At the other end of the scale, 15% of returners had advanced level qualifications compared to 4% of non-returners. In terms of educational achievement then, measured by formal qualifications, non-returners were markedly less well placed than returners.

A similar picture emerges when we look at the age at which initial full-time education was completed.

Table 2.8: Age of Completion of Initial Full-Time Education

	Total Sample N=1826 %	Non-Returners N=1061 %	Returners N=765 %
15 or under	53	59	44
16	21	21	20
17	8	6	10
18	5	4	7
19 or under	13	9	18
Don't know	1	1	1

Non-returners were more likely to have left school when they were aged 15 or younger and less likely to have completed their initial full-time education at age 19 or over. In addition, only 15% of non-returners compared with 29% of returners had taken a full-time course (one lasting nine months or more) within two years of leaving school.

The data on previous educational experience which we have, lend some weight to the hypothesis that returners tend to have had a more positive experience of initial full-time education than non-returners. We are not suggesting that this is the only, or even the main, reason for non-returners' lack of interest in participating in education and training. We do think it is *a* factor which interacts with many others to produce a lack of interest. Clearly, nothing can be done to change the past educational experience of returners. What these data imply is that returning to education and training needs to be portrayed as different from initial full-time education to help convert non-returners into returners.

Many of our sample will have memories of education as meaning selection at age 12, of segregation into different types of school or into different bands within the local town school and of the value placed on cognitive-intellectual skills. Furthermore, we should not overlook the fact that 44% of returners left school aged 15 or below. We stress that we offer experience of initial full-time education as *one* factor behind the negative image of education and training held by the 58% of our sample who were non-returners. We do not want to anticipate our case-study data in this area. We hope to collect fuller information about the influence of previous educational experience on returning.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The data we have presented so far indicate that there are marked social class differences in participation rates in education and training. We drew attention to the fact that 77% of those in classes DE had not participated as adults in education and training. We have further suggested that non-returners hold a negative image of education and training as uninteresting, unenjoyable and useless in the labour market or in terms of personal fulfilment. We have speculated that non-returners' experience of initial full-time education has contributed to this negative image, which may well be reinforced by a work or social milieu in which education and training is not valued.

On the basis of these data, there are no easy solutions to the problem of massively increasing participation rates. As we will see in the next chapter, there are certainly things that could be done to improve participation rates marginally. However, we see these as essentially palliative measures. They might be important for particular groups who identify specific barriers to participation. However, they do not attack the fundamental problem of lack of interest in returning. We suggest that there may well be a hierarchy of factors affecting participation. There are some factors which are so fundamental, such as lack of interest, that other factors are not even considered. We are also mindful that employers and providers of adult education and training have an important part to play in encouraging return.

Using our general population data as a basis for generating policy our key points are:

- *There is a widespread lack of interest in returning to education and training.*
- *We speculate that this lack of interest stems in part from negative school experience.*

If the aim is to make an impact on groups who are massively under-represented in education and training at the moment, then the following messages need to get across:

- *Where education and training for adults is different from being at school this needs to be made clear. The ways in which it is different need to be spelt out eg teaching approaches, assessment methods, the wide range of educational opportunities that is now available.*
- *Education and training are useful in the labour market. This has to be a credible claim. Given current unemployment levels, bland statements that education and training either lead to jobs or improve your chances of promotion are hardly likely to cut much ice.*
- *Education and training can be intrinsically worthwhile in themselves. Over 40% of our returners mentioned personal interests or hobbies as a purpose of returning.*
- *The variety of purposes for which people do return to education and training suggests a variety of* **provision**, *not only in terms of subject matter, but also in terms of availability eg day and evening classes, open learning, and block release.*

So far we have concentrated on what we have called fundamental factors affecting participation in education and training. Our respondents identified other factors which influenced their return or non-return, and we describe these factors in Chapter 3. Among these factors are issues concerning adults' lack of knowledge of the educational opportunities available to them. Chapter 3 considers this and other factors affecting return in more detail.

CHAPTER 3

SUBSIDIARY FACTORS AFFECTING RETURN TO EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Introduction

In Chapter 2 we identified what we have called fundamental factors affecting adult return to education and training. We highlighted the positive image of education and training held by returners. They saw education and training as useful and/or enjoyable and returned predominantly for these reasons. We pointed to the importance of social class and of previous educational experience in helping to formulate this positive image. Conversely, non-returners held a negative image of education and training. They saw it as boring and useless. Again, we speculated that social class and previous educational experience were important in forming this negative view. Our interview schedule, however, allowed respondents to identify a whole range of factors affecting their return or non-return to education and training. This chapter reports the data on what we have called subsidiary factors affecting return.

These factors are subsidiary in two ways. First of all, they were identified by very small percentages of our sample as affecting their return or non-return. Secondly, the clustering of responses around the factors concerning the usefulness and enjoyment of education and training led us to speculate that there was a hierarchy of factors affecting participation. Some factors were so overwhelming in affecting the decision to return or not that other factors were irrelevant and so were not mentioned by respondents. For instance, if someone is not interested in returning to education and training, then other factors, such as the cost of courses, or the travelling involved, simply do not apply. Conversely, if someone is convinced of the value of returning in job terms, let us say, then potential barriers such as travelling and cost are surmounted in pursuit of career advancement. It could be, therefore, that some of the factors to which little importance has been attached by our sample are more important than at first sight. We hope to have more to say about the notion of a hierarchy of factors affecting return as a result of the case-studies which we will be carrying out in the later phases of our research.

Also in this chapter we consider our data on knowledge of the educational and training opportunities available to adults. Our

reason for highlighting this particular factor is that much is made of it in the literature on adult education and training as a key factor affecting return.

The wide range of subsidiary factors affecting return

Table 3.1 shows all the subsidiary factors identified by non-returners as preventing their return to education and training. We should make it clear that 'subsidiary factors' is our phrase. Table 3.1 shows the reasons identified as *most important* for not returning by our sample. We see these as *subsidiary* because of the

Table 3.1: Subsidiary Reasons for Non-Participation

	N=1061 %
Couldn't afford to	4
Learn more from life than studying	4
Studying wouldn't help financially	2
Time at school put me off studying	2
No suitable course in the area	2
Didn't know sort of classes would like to do	2
Don't have qualifications to apply	2
No point/wouldn't help find a job	1
Studying isn't for people like me	1
Courses aren't useful to me	1
Having a medical problem makes it difficult	1
Too much travelling involved	*
Didn't know how to find out what classes there are	*
Being physically disabled makes it difficult	*
Did apply – wasn't offered a place	*
Spouse didn't want me to	*
Employer didn't want me to	*
None of friends/family go to classes	0
Studying would make me dissatisfied with my life	0
Other	8
Don't know	4

* numbers too small to quantify

small numbers identifying these reasons, compared to the larger numbers identifying lack of interest, lack of time and so on, which we see as *fundamental* factors affecting participation. We discussed these fundamental factors in Chapter 2.

There are three main points worth highlighting in this table. First, the range of reasons identified as the most important for non-return is very wide. Small base numbers make it meaningless to highlight age, class and educational qualification differences in the reasons cited. However, it *is* worth drawing attention to the fact that although only 4% cite cost as the most important reason for non-participation; cost was identified as a barrier by 13% of DEs compared with around 6% of other social classes. Thus cost is a factor affecting the participation of DEs more than of other social classes.

Secondly, lack of knowledge about, or access to, educational opportunities do not seem to be major factors affecting participation. This is interesting because it directly contradicts previous research and indeed our own data. As we shall see below, non-returners were not very well informed about the educational and training opportunities available locally. Nor did they know much about the range of providers of education and training, nor about distance or open learning. It may be that lack of knowledge was not given as a barrier to participation because non-returners assumed that they knew what was available and were not interested in it. Conversely, it may be a good example of the hierarchy of factors in operation. If you are not interested in returning, or your domestic commitments prevent you returning, then knowledge of the opportunities available is hardly likely to figure prominently as a factor affecting your return.

Thirdly, it is interesting that such a small percentage of our sample explicitly cited the lack of use of education or unhappy previous educational experience as the most important reason preventing return. It may be that the fundamental factors such as 'lack of interest' and 'lack of time' are more socially acceptable euphemisims for criticisms of previous educational experience. It may be, indeed, that our hypotheses about the influence of previous educational experience is wrong. Our case-study work will illuminate this.

Table 3.2 shows the subsidiary factors promoting return cited by returners. Again we should emphasise that these factors are subsidiary *in our eyes*. The fundamental factors encouraging return, which we reported in Chapter 2 were the usefulness of, interest in

and enjoyment of education and training. We see these as fundamental because of various pieces of data from the survey. The data in Table 3.2 show other reasons given by returners as the most important for their return to education and training.

Table 3.2: Subsidiary Reasons for Participation

	N=765 %
Thought it might help me find a job	6
Give me something to do	4
Interested in studying/courses	4
Thought it might help financially	4
Have friends/family who go to classes	2
Learn a lot from classes/study	1
Enjoyed time at school – wanted to do classes	1
There was a suitable course in the area	*
Felt I could afford it	*
Saw advert/heard about it/know someone who did it	*
Family encouraged me	*
Didn't involve too much travel	0
Other	3
Don't know	1

* numbers too small to quantify

As with non-returners, there is a wide range of reasons cited by returners as the most important for their return. Again, small base numbers make it impossible to highlight age, class and educational qualification differences in the reasons given. However, women were more likely than men to cite 'having someone to go on the course with' and as 'giving them something to do' as the most important reason for going back to education and training.

As with non-returners too, one is struck by the apparently minimal impact on the decision to return made by advertising or more generally by knowing what was available. It seems as if the initiative to return is not generated by straightforward advertising of opportunities. Our follow up work with returners suggests that the need or desire to return comes first, and then people set about finding out what is available. This is not to suggest that more and

different kinds of publicity is unnecessary. Indeed, better information about courses and classes is needed (see below). It suggests that better advertising of courses is not the magic answer to increasing participation in education and training. It is to our data on knowledge of opportunities for education and training that we now turn.

Knowledge of educational and training opportunities

As mentioned above, knowledge of the opportunities available for education and training has frequently been cited by researchers as a major factor affecting adult participation in education and training. Our survey tried to assess adults' knowledge of such opportunities by asking three questions. First we asked a general question, 'Are there any classes, study or training opportunities for adults in your local area?'. This was followed by a specific question on open or distance learning, since this kind of opportunity is an important growth area. The question here was 'Are there any classes, study or training opportunities open to adults which someone could do totally from home?'. And lastly we attempted to assess adults' general knowledge of opportunities by asking a question about providers of education and training: 'Who provides or promotes classes, study or training opportunities for adults?'

Table 3.3 shows responses to the general question about local opportunities and differentiates these responses in terms of

Table 3.3: Knowledge of Local Education and Training Opportunities

			Potential	Non-	Class			
	All	Returners	Returners	Returners	AB	C1	C2	DE
	N=1826	765	89	972	272	365	532	657
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes	66	76	65	58	78	68	68	57
No	14	10	15	16	8	12	13	18
Don't know	21	14	20	26	14	20	20	24

returners, potential returners (those who had made enquiries about courses but had not actually returned) and non-returners. It

also shows class differences.

It can be seen that returners and potential returners were more knowledgeable about the existence of local opportunities than non-returners. The class differences are also immediately apparent, with almost a quarter of DEs not knowing whether local opportunities existed compared to 14% of ABs. Lack of knowledge about local opportunities was more frequent among the 20–24 and 55+ age groups. The 20–24 age group, however, contained the largest proportion of potential returners (see Chapter 4 on future demand). This suggests that publicity targeted at this age group could have a positive effect.

Overall, however, the important message from these data is the extent of ignorance about local opportunities for education and training. It is true that we have no means of knowing how our respondents were interpreting 'locally'. Some may have interpreted this as meaning within a few streets of their home, whereas others may have answered in relation to the town or city in which they lived. Nevertheless, the fact that over 20% of our sample did not know whether local opportunities existed is worrying. Of course, awareness of the existence of local opportunities might be related to whether opportunities actually did exist. One might expect people to be better informed about education and training if a number of opportunities were available in their area. Unfortunately, we have no way of mapping existing provision against the data on knowledge of local opportunities. Provision tends to be concentrated on large population centres, as one would expect. The geographic distribution of our sample is in terms of three large areas, East, West and North. There was no significant difference in the percentages of 'Don't knows' amongst these three Regions. The figures are 19, 20 and 22 per cent, respectively. Ideally, a decision on whether or not to return to education and training should be based on sound information of the options available. It is clear that sizeable proportions of non-returners, particularly in DE social class, are unaware of the opportunities available to them.

The extent of ignorance of opportunities is even more stark when we come to look at open and distance learning opportunities. Table 3.4 reveals this.

Table 3.4: Awareness of Distance Learning Opportunities

	All	Returners	Potential Returners	Non-Returners	Class AB	C1	C2	DE
N=	1826	765	89	972	272	365	532	657
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes	25	34	25	19	43	30	26	15
No	26	23	27	27	17	23	26	30
Don't Know	49	43	48	54	40	46	47	56

There are some differences between classes and between returners, potential returners and non-returners. However, these pale into insignificance compared to the high level of ignorance across all groups about the existence of open or distance learning. Almost half our sample did not know whether such provision existed and alarmingly high percentages were adamant that no such courses existed. Taken together, these figures show that 75% of our total sample were ignorant about distance or open learning opportunities. This suggests a clear need for providers of distance and open learning to improve their publicity.

Knowledge about providers of education and training was more encouraging. The majority of respondents were able to identify at least one provider. Here again, however, there was quite a bit of ignorance with a quarter of the sample unable to name any provider. Table 3.5 gives details of the providers identified. We counted both specific institutions such as further education colleges, and more general providers such as local authorities, as indicating knowledge of providers.

The education and training opportunities provided by the local authorities and the further education colleges were the most frequently mentioned. It seems likely that awareness of these providers is highest both because these sectors have traditionally been seen as catering for adults and because they tend to advertise prominently in the local press. Sometimes, indeed, they produce special pull-out supplements distributed with free newspapers, and these supplements allow potential clients to browse through the kinds of opportunities that are available.

Table 3.5: Knowledge About Providers of Education and Training

	All	Returner	Potential Returner	Non-Returner	Class AB	C1	C2	DE
	1826	765	89	972	272	365	532	657
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Local Authority	33	45	47	23	56	39	30	24
FE Colleges	29	32	28	26	32	31	27	27
Schools	11	11	14	10	10	10	11	11
Community Educn	9	12	6	8	8	10	10	9
Open University	9	13	13	6	21	12	8	4
Government/MSC	9	11	6	8	8	13	8	7
Adult basic educn	4	5	5	3	3	4	5	4
Univ adult educn	3	5	1	2	12	3	2	1
Open College/Tech	2	2	4	2	4	3	2	2
Private providers	2	3	2	1	6	3	1	1
Place of work	2	2	0	1	2	2	2	*
Sports Centre	1	2	0	1	1	1	2	1
WEA	1	3	0	*	4	3	0	*
Professional Assocn	1	2	2	0	4	1	*	*
Women's Institute	1	1	0	1	1	*	*	1
Trade Union	*	1	0	*	1	1	*	*
Indust Trg Board	*	*	1	*	0	*	*	*
Other	6	9	7	3	11	7	5	3
There aren't any	1	1	0	1	1	1	*	1
Don't know	25	14	20	34	11	20	27	32

* numbers too small to quantify

The only other type of provider to be mentioned by more than 10% of our sample was schools. However, awareness of the Open University and University Adult Education provision was relatively high among ABs, with 21% and 12% respectively identifying these providers. Other providers with a relatively high profile for some groups are Government/MSC and Community Education.

It is interesting that so few respondents mentioned their place of work as a provider of training, especially in view of our findings that so many returners were taking courses which were vocationally oriented (see Chapter 2). Perhaps this was a function of the way in which respondents defined providers of education and training. They may have thought that our interest was in traditional providers rather than in workplace training. If this is so, then in-company training has been under-represented in our findings. Our follow-up work with returners will specifically explore in-company training and we may have more to say on this issue later in the project.

As might be expected in view of our earlier findings on class, awareness of providers was lowest among DEs – 32% were unable to identify a single provider – and highest among ABs – only 11% were unable to identify a provider. Unsurprisingly too, returners were better informed than non-returners about almost all categories of provider and were far more likely to know of at least one provider. Potential returners were far more likely to identify local authority provision than non-returners.

We have to bear in mind that our data here might under-represent knowledge of providers. Some providers, such as the WEA, may use other institutions in which to hold classes and so our respondents may not have been able to identify the real provider of education and training. Similarly, our categories are not mutually exclusive and respondents who mentioned the local authority as a provider may have had in mind further education colleges, community education provision and schools. Even if this is the case, our data suggest that many providers need to raise their profile. The type of advertising undertaken by local authorities/further education colleges seems to have been relatively successful in making adults aware of some aspects of their provision. Clearly other providers need to re-think their marketing strategies.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

This chapter has been concerned with what we have called subsidiary factors affecting participation in education and training.

Whereas Chapter 2 concentrated on fundamental factors, such as previous educational experience and social class as contributing to either a positive or negative view of education and training, this chapter has looked at lower order factors. The key point to be made here is:

- *There seems to be a hierarchy of factors affecting participation. Factors such as the cost of courses and the travelling involved are just not relevant if you are uninterested in returning. Conversely such factors are unlikely to prevent return, if there is a commitment to returning.*

Knowledge of education and training opportunities has featured prominently amongst these lower order factors. The key points to be made here are:

- *There is widespread ignorance about the opportunities available. Over 20% of our sample did not know if there were local opportunities for education and training.*
- *There is widespread ignorance about open learning and distance learning. Some 75% of our sample did not know about this provision.*
- *Local authorities in general and further education colleges in particular have been more successful than other providers in advertising their existence as providers of education and training for adults.*
- *Providers of education and training need to re-think their marketing strategies.*

CHAPTER 4

FUTURE DEMAND FOR ADULT EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Introduction

We tried to estimate the future demand for adult education and training in two main ways. First and most straightforwardly, we simply asked all our respondents whether there were any classes, study or training which they would like to do in the future. However, the answers to this question have to be treated as a weak indicator of future demand. This is because we have no way of knowing how firm an intention respondents were expressing. Some may have indicated classes which were no more than a remote possibility; others may have identified classes which they firmly intended to return to; others again may have had no intention of returning and were simply giving a socially acceptable answer. We tried to take account of this problem in estimating demand in a second way. This was by paying attention to a particular group of respondents whom we have called *potential returners*. These are respondents who have not returned to education and training to date, but who have in the past made enquiries about classes, study or training. We suspected that the business of making enquiries about courses, indicated a firmer intention to return than merely expressing an interest in taking classes at an unspecified future date.

We thus report two separate approaches to estimating the future demand for education and training in this chapter. We begin by looking at the response of our total sample to a series of questions about their future intentions. This is followed by concentrating on what we know about potential returners.

The extent of demand for future courses

Only 35% of our total sample said that there were courses, classes, study or training which they would like to do in the future. Some 60% of our sample said that they had no interest in returning to adult education and training. If we look at the characteristics of those expressing an interest in return, some important points emerge. Table 4.1 shows these.

Table 4.1: Characteristics of Those Intending to Take Courses in the Future

		Sex		Age Band					Class			
	All	Men	Women	20-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55+	AB	C1	C2	DE
N=	1826	846	980	215	364	311	293	644	272	365	532	657
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Future Courses												
Yes	35	34	36	46	55	45	29	18	55	37	37	24
No	60	61	59	46	38	47	67	80	40	57	58	71
Don't know	5	4	5	9	6	8	4	2	5	6	5	4

We can see that very similar proportions of men and women expressed desire to take a course in the future. However, there are clear age and class differences.

The highest percentage of those interested in taking a course in the future was among the under 45 year olds. In marketing terms it appears that courses aimed at the 25-34 age group might generate a good response as 55% of this age group expressed an interest in future courses. The class differences are again striking, with 55% of ABs expressing an interest in returning compared with 24% of DEs.

The age and class characteristics of those wanting to take courses in the future are particularly interesting because, as we shall see later in this chapter, they are similar to those of potential returners. This perhaps enhances the reliability of estimating the future demand for courses from this general data. However, before considering potential returners in more detail, let us examine our general data on future demand.

There were differences between groups. In employment terms, 42% of those who were working, but only 29% of those who were not, expressed an interest in future courses. However, if we omit future courses which were related to the adult's current job (such courses are by definition not relevant to those not working), then we find that a similar proportion (28%) of those who were and were not working, expressed an interest in taking a course in the future. This suggests that current employment has a significant effect on the likelihood of participation in education and training. If we consider these data alongside the 'factors' data in Chapter 2, it seems as though education and training are seen as more useful once you are in work than in helping you get a job in the first place.

There was a large difference in intention to return between those who did and did not possess educational qualifications. Some 22% of those with no qualifications expressed an interest in future courses compared with 41% of those with minimum level qualifications (less than 5 'O' grades) and 55% of those with more than minimum level.

It will be seen that our data on fundamental factors affecting participation are consistent with our data on future intentions. The class and previous educational experience of our respondents are dominant indicators of the likely future interest in education and training, just as they are for participation in adult education and training in general. We have been able to refine this picture a little by adding two further characteristics influencing demand. These

are the importance of being in work and the interest among the under 45s in future courses. A further influence on future demand could be whether there had already been a return to education and training. We were, therefore, interested in what our returners had to say about their intentions of taking courses in the future.

Returners and future demand for education and training

The first point to make here is that a greater proportion of returners than of non-returners said they would like to take courses in the future. This is hardly surprising.

Table 4.2: Future Intentions of Returners

	All N=1826 %	Returners N=765 %	Non-Returners N=1061 %
Future Course			
Yes	35	49	25
No	60	45	70
Don't Know	5	6	4

What is more surprising is that 45% of returners expressed no interest in returning. This apparent lack of interest in returning is surprising in view of the commitment of returners to their courses. In Chapter 2 we drew attention to the fact that 66% of returners were on courses lasting 11 weeks or more. All we can suggest to explain these data is that there may be two types of commitment to courses. There may be a commitment to a particular course or subject which adults follow through until they feel that they have exhausted the courses on that subject. A different kind of commitment may be to participating in adult education and training in general. Adults who indicated that they wanted to take a course in the future are more likely to be those who fell into the second category. Beyond this, of course, our survey question assumed that returning is well thought out and pre-planned. As we mentioned in Chapter 3, we know for some returners that the decision to return is not like this at all. Rather it is generated by a variety of factors and is more spontaneous than our survey

questions allowed. There is the further possibility that some adults were wary of indicating that they wanted to take a certain course in advance of successfully completing their current course. It may be that adults studying 'O' grades and Highers, for instance, are chary of indicating plans for college or university in advance of attaining the necessary entry qualifications.

Whatever the explanation for the high percentage of returners expressing no interest in further returns, three main points stand out from these data:

- Returners are more interested in further courses than non-returners.
- 49% of returners expressed an interest in returning in the future.
- As many as a quarter of non-returners expressed an interest in returning to classes in the future.

Taken together with the extent of previous participation in education and training, these figures give some cause for concern. Some 42% of our total sample had returned to education and training at some time, and 35% of our total sample expressed an interest in attending classes in the future.

Strict comparisons of participation rates with other countries are not really possible, given different sampling techniques and differently worded survey questions. Perhaps the most appropriate comparison is with the ACACE (1982) survey in England and Wales. Here 47% of their total sample as opposed to our 42% had returned to education and training. Differences in the sample and in what counted as education and training probably account for most of the difference between participation rates here. However, 61% of the ACACE sample said that they would like to take a course in the future, as compared to our 35%. There were differences in the wording used for this question and the proportion of returners in this 61% is not clear. Nevertheless, the comparison is worth making.

What kinds of courses are in demand?

As well as asking respondents whether there were courses they would like to do in the future, we asked about the subject matter of such courses, the purpose of such courses and the preferred mode of attendance. It will be seen from the data below that interest was expressed in a wide variety of courses. (Categories are an adaptation of those used by ACACE.)

Table 4.3: Subjects in Demand

	Total N=642 %	Men N=291 %	Women N=350 %
Computer studies	12	11	12
Foreign languages	10	8	11
Handicrafts	9	1	16
Shorthand/typing/office	9	*	17
Cookery	7	*	12
Art (painting etc)	7	6	7
Science/maths/technology	7	8	6
Business/management	6	10	4
Trades/service subjects	6	9	4
Engineering/technical	5	12	0
Arts subjects	5	5	4
English language/lit	5	4	5
Sports/keep fit	4	4	4
Social work/services	4	3	5
Drama/music	4	3	4
Nursing/midwifery	3	1	5
Social science	3	2	4
Carpentry/DIY	3	5	2
Hobbies (non sport)	3	4	3
Teacher training	2	3	2
Health course	2	1	2
Car maintenance	2	3	1
Photography	2	4	1
Trade union courses	1	1	*
Building trades/surveying	1	2	*
Creative writing	1	2	1
Other courses	11	14	8
Don't know	3	4	2

* numbers too small to quantify

Only computer studies and foreign languages capture the interest of 10% or more of our total sample, although there were particular subjects of interest only to one sex. These subjects were

unsurprising. Handicrafts, shorthand/typing and cookery were almost exclusively of interest to women. Similarly, engineering, business/management and trades subjects were of more interest to men. What was more surprising was the lack of sex bias in the demand for courses in computing and in science, mathematics and technology.

Small base numbers make it inappropriate to generalise about courses preferred by particular social classes, age groups and previous educational experience. No preliminary hypotheses emerge from such analyses in any event.

The purpose of future returns

Both vocational and personal interest factors featured highly among the purposes of future return.

Table 4.4: The Purposes of Future Return

	Total N=642 %	Men N=291 %	Women N=350 %	Returners N=372 %	Non-Returners N=269 %
The job you are doing now	19	31	9	23	14
A job you hope to get	26	20	31	22	31
Increasing your qualifications	22	24	21	24	19
Personal interests/hobbies	59	56	61	60	57
Unwaged work (housework/ voluntary)	1	1	1	1	1
Other	2	2	2	2	2
Don't know	3	2	4	2	4

Note: Respondents were able to give more than one answer and so the totals exceed 100

At first glance, personal interests appear to dominate the purpose of future returns. However, if we take present and future job purposes together, 45% of our sample identify vocational purposes for return. If we add to this those indicating increasing qualifications as a purpose, we have a total of 67% identifying vocational purposes for future participation in education and training. It is difficult to be precise here since qualifications can be gained for personal satisfaction as well as for their exchange value in the labour market. The important point is that both personal interest and vocational motives feature strongly in the purposes of future return.

There are clear differences in the purpose cited by men and women. Men were much more likely than women to cite their *current job* as a reason for returning in the future. Conversely, women were more likely to cite a possible *future job*. This reflects a difference in work status of the two groups: some 65% of women were not working compared to 33% of men.

This difference in work status may also explain the different emphasis given by returners and by non-returners in the purposes of return. Returners were interested in both current and future job relatedness while non-returners were more likely to cite a job they hoped to get as the purpose of future participation in education and training. About 54% of non-returners were unemployed, compared to 46% of returners.

So far our data on future demand has shown no clear pattern on the subject matter of courses. Similarly, the purposes of future return have been fairly evenly divided between job-relatedness and personal interest. When we come to look at the preferred mode of future participation in courses, however, clear messages emerge.

Preferred mode of attendance

We asked our 642 respondents expressing an interest in returning to education and training in the future about their preferred mode of attendance. Table 4.5 shows their answers.

Table 4.5: Preferred Mode of Attendance

	Total N=642 %	Men N=291 %	Women N=350 %
Full-time	15	18	13
Part-time during the day	23	12	32
Day release	7	11	3
Sandwich/block release	2	4	1
Evening class	45	44	46
Correspondence	5	7	3
Other	2	3	1
Don't know	4	5	3

There is a clear preference for evening classes by both men and women. We do not know, of course, whether this is because it is

most familiar or whether other modes have been tried and found to be unsatisfactory. Looking more closely at women's preferences, almost one third of the sample prefer part-time attendance during the day, perhaps because of domestic commitments. Day and block release seem unpopular. Also unpopular are correspondence courses. Again, it is impossible to say whether this is based on previous experience or on unfamiliarity. In the case of correspondence courses, it gives pause for thought to those committed to developing distance and open learning.

There were some differences amongst groups which are worth pointing out. Working status was associated with particular preferences. Evening classes were preferred by 51% of those in work, compared to 37% of those not working. Only 9% of those in work preferred part-time day courses, compared to 42% of those out of work. We suspect that this difference is partly accounted for by the gender differences mentioned above.

There were also some age and social class effects. Full-time and day release courses were most likely to be preferred by those in the 20-24 age range and were least popular with those over 44. Interest in full-time courses was highest among DEs and lowest among ABs. There was less interest in part-time day classes among C2s (13%) than in any other class.

There was little difference between returners and non-returners in their preferred mode of attendance.

Just as in modes of attendance a clear pattern emerged in response to a question on certification of future courses, as Table 4.6 demonstrates.

Table 4.6: The Demand for Certification

	Total N=642 %
Certificate	52
No certificate	30
Don't mind	8
Don't know	9

Over half these interested in taking courses in the future said they would like the course to result in a certificate. This preference

Table 4.7: The Demand for Certification by Course

	Computer Studies N=76 %	Foreign Languages N=61 %	Secretarial N=59 %	Handicrafts N=57 %
Yes	48	30	79	9
No	24	38	10	76
Don't mind	9	22	5	4
Don't know	19	11	6	11

	Cookery N=57 %	Business N=41 %	Engineering N=35 %
Yes	32	59	79
No	52	13	14
Don't mind	11	5	1
Don't know	5	22	5

for certificates seems extremely high, especially in view of the earlier finding that 22% of this group gave the purpose of return as gaining a qualification. It may be that asking a specific question on certification concentrated respondents' minds. Certainly when we looked at the demand for certification in relation to the seven most popular subjects, a picture emerged about these courses' vocational or general interest orientation.

We think it fair to suggest that those intending to return to handicraft will do so overwhelmingly for personal interest reasons. Just as those intending to return to engineering and secretarial classes will be doing so for vocational reasons. The table warns us, however, about the dangers of being too glib in using the subject matter of courses alone as an indicator of the primacy of vocational or of personal interest motives in returning to education and training. The 38% who do not want a certificate in foreign languages, strongly suggests a personal interest motive such as being able to communicate while on holiday abroad.

The other major point to make about certification is that there is a steady decline in preference for qualifications as age increases. As many as 78% of 20–24 year olds were interested in courses which would result in certificates. Only 11% of the 55+ group were interested in such courses.

All the data on future demand which we have considered so far suggest the need for diversity of provision. Future returners show an interest in a wide range of subject matter. They return for a variety of purposes. They show a clear preference for evening classes as a mode of attendance, but certain groups show preferences for other modes. There is a high demand for certification of vocational courses, and less of a demand for certification of personal interest courses. All this points to keeping as many adult education pots boiling as possible, if these diverse demands are to be met. Does the same picture emerge when we look more closely at those who have made enquiries about courses, but who have not yet participated in education and training?

Potential returners

Before examining the data on potential returners, we should stress that we are dealing with small numbers. Potential returners constituted just 5% (N=89) of our total sample, and 8% of our total non-returner population. Generalisations from this number

should be treated cautiously. However, it seemed to us that potential returners had distinctive characteristics as a group which are important for two reasons. First, they suggest areas where efforts to increase participation in education and training could be targeted. Secondly, they help to substantiate our view that there are fundamental factors affecting return to education and training.

What are the distinctive characteristics of potential returners? Table 4.8 shows these by comparing them with non-returners.

Table 4.8: Characteristics of Potential Returners

	Potential Returners (PR) N=89 %	Non-Returners (excluding PR) N=972 %
Sex		
Men	46	44
Women	54	56
Age		
20–24	28	13
25–34	34	19
35–44	9	15
45–54	10	15
55+	19	38
Class		
AB	16	6
C1	15	15
C2	36	30
DE	32	49

Almost two thirds of potential returners fall into the under 35 age-range (N=55). This, taken together with current demographic trends, suggests that providers could profitably target the under

35s. In social class terms, the C2s and DEs form the largest proportion of the potential returner population. The table could be misleading here, however, as these classes formed the greatest representation in our total sample. If we consider potential returners as a proportion of all members of particular social classes, then 20% of ABs are potential returners, compared with 8% of C1s, 10% of C2s and 6% of DEs.

When we came to look at factors other than class affecting participation, potential returners tend to cite different factors from other non-returners.

Table 4.9: Most Important Factors Affecting Participation: Potential Returners and Non-Returners

	Potential Returners (PR) N=89 %	Non-Returners (excluding PR) N=972 %
Not really interested	9	30
Haven't got the time	21	16
Have to look after the children/dependents	17	13
Wouldn't help in a job	2	8
No suitable course in the area	7	2

The table suggests, and we stress that because of small numbers of potential returners it can only suggest, that there are distinctive factors affecting the non-participation of potential returners. Potential returners cite time factors more frequently than non-returners. They also cite the lack of suitable courses more frequently than non-returners. On the other hand, 9% give lack of interest as the most important factor compared with 30% of non-returners giving this reason for lack of participation. One has to conclude that either potential returners are more socially adept than non-returners at giving 'acceptable' reasons for not returning, or that time factors are genuinely constraining them from returning. Our inclination is towards the genuine constraints of domestic commitments and other time factors, and hence a view that potential returners are likely to continue to be interested in returning to education and training. Indeed over two thirds of

potential returners expressed a desire to take courses in the future. Interestingly enough, potential returners were much more likely than either returners or non-returners to want job related courses when asked about future intentions.

Our view of potential returners' likely continuing interest in education and training is supported by the data on potential returners' previous educational experience. If educational experience is indeed a fundamental factor affecting return, potential returners were different from non-returners and more like returners.

Table 4.10: Educational Experience of Returners, Potential Returners and Non-Returners

	Returners N=765 %	Potential Returners N=89 %	Non-Returners (excluding PR) N=972 %
None	22	34	59
Less than 5 'O' grades	24	29	16
5 or more 'O' grades	11	7	4
Apprenticeship	10	10	7
Intermediate	3	2	1
Higher/'A' level	10	6	3
Advanced	15	10	3
Other/Don't know	5	2	7

A similar pattern emerged when we looked at school leaving age. Potential returners were more likely than non-returners to have completed their education at age 19 or over and to have taken a full-time course within two years of leaving school.

In summary, our data on potential returners suggests the following:

- Potential returners are different from non-returners in terms of educational experience, age, class and in the factors affecting their participation in education and training.

- Potential returners are likely to maintain an interest in returning to education and training.
- Potential returners are more interested in job related future courses than are returners or non-returners.
- Potential returners are likely to be under 35.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

In this chapter we have approached the question of future demand for education and training in two ways. First, we considered the information gained by asking a series of questions about future provision. Secondly, we looked at a particular group of respondents, whom we called potential returners. This group had already expressed an interest in returning by making enquiries about courses, but for one reason or another had not actually participated in education and training. We suspected this group might have firmer intentions of returning to education and training in the future than other non-returners.

Taking all these pieces of information together what can we say about future demand?

A. The Extent of Future Demand

- *Estimating the extent of future demand is difficult. This should be firmly borne in mind when reading the remainder of this section. We have no way of knowing how firm an intention to return to courses in the future is. Furthermore, decisions to return may be spontaneous rather than pre-planned.*
- *The numbers expressing an interest in taking courses in the future are comparatively low. Only 35% of our sample expressed such an interest.*
- *People who had already returned to education and training were more likely to say that they intended to return in the future.*
- *Only 25% of those who had never returned expressed an interest in doing so. Of these, around 35% were potential returners. Future demand is strongest among under 35s and within the AB social class.*
- *Attracting people back into education and training who have not previously participated in it will be difficult. Our data do not suggest that there is a latent demand for education and training among non-returners.*

B. The Kind of Provision in Demand

- *There is a demand for a wide variety of courses in terms of subjects.*
- *There is a preference for part-time provision.*
- *There is an overwhelming preference for evening classes. As a second choice, women clearly prefer part-time day classes to other kinds of provision.*
- *Correspondence courses seem unpopular. Open and distance learning providers need to take this into account in marketing their courses.*
- *Vocational and personal interest or hobby motives feature strongly as purposes.*
- *There is a demand for certification of vocational courses.*

CHAPTER 5

POLICY IMPLICATIONS OF THE RESEARCH: AN OVERVIEW

Introduction

This study arose out of labour policy concerns. Economic trends convinced the government that Britain needed a flexible and responsive workforce in order to achieve and sustain economic growth in a fiercely competitive world market. One way of obtaining a flexible and responsive work force was through the participation of that workforce in education and training. However, little was known about the participation of adults in education and training in Scotland and so research was commissioned to help inform policy. It is appropriate, therefore, to try to draw together the various threads of this report into a final series of policy implications. It is important to make four things clear, however, before we do so.

Firstly, it was not in our remit to investigate the validity of the assertion that Britain needs a flexible and responsive workforce. Even if this had been an aspect of the research, since we are not economists, we would have been unable to carry it out. Nor have we been able to investigate the claim that recurrent education and training is a means to achieving this end. This is a case where we have been unable to hold in question the ideology underpinning the research.

Secondly, this report concentrates on one aspect of the research, a survey of the general population in Scotland about their participation or lack of participation in education and training. The policy implications deriving from this survey will be supplemented in due course by policy implications generated by a survey of providers of education and training and by a survey of employers. In other words, the policy implications here are derived from the general population's views and can only tell us part of the story about adult participation in education and training.

Thirdly, we have not confined ourselves to researching vocational training: indeed, as Chapter 1 tries to make clear, we had a very wide view of what counted as education and training. Our intention has been to provide a general picture of adult participation in Scotland which can be used as a backcloth for more particularistic studies by ourselves and others.

Lastly, Some of the data on adult returners which we collected as part of the survey are not reported here. We are currently following up a sample of these returners and we intend to produce a separate report.

Our approach has been to identify what seem to us to be the main issues arising from Chapters 2, 3 and 4 and to extrapolate policy implications from these. A fuller discussion of the issues and a more discursive approach to the policy implications can, of course, be found in these chapters.

THE EXTENT OF PARTICIPATION

A participation rate of 42% of the general adult population in some form of education and training is in itself encouraging. However, the low participation rates of those in social class DE, where 77% have never returned to education and training is appalling.

Policy Implication: If a flexible and responsive work force is required in all sections of the British economy, then particular efforts are needed to encourage semi- and unskilled workers back into education and training.

Policy Implication: Less attention needs to be paid to the professions since 74% of ABs have returned to education and training at some time.

Policy Implication: Attempts should be made to attract under 35s in particular back into education and training. They are likely to be more responsive than older age groups.

FACTORS AFFECTING PARTICIPATION

There is a hierarchy of factors affecting participation. A fundamental factor, lack of interest in returning, is associated not only with social class, but also with previous educational experience. The less successful initial education has been, the less likely is interest in returning.

Policy Implication: Many of the previous suggestions for improving participation rates, such as improved educational guidance services, may only have marginal effects, in terms of numbers. The quality of guidance is, of course, a separate issue.

Policy Implication: The usefulness of education and training needs to be forcefully portrayed. This applies both to usefulness in the labour market and usefulness in terms of personal enjoyment or fulfilment.

Policy Implication: Where education and training is different from the probable school experience of adults, this needs to be highlighted. Attention should be drawn to new teaching methods, resources and, where appropriate, to new approaches to assessment.

Particular factors are associated with particular groups, such as women and those in work. Those in employment tend to see returning to job related education and training as more useful in relation to their current employment or promotion than in finding a job.

Policy Implication: More extensive provision of facilities (such as creches) by providers, may encourage more women to return to education and training.

Policy Implication: Adult education needs to be made attractive to both the employed and the unemployed. The value of developing both specific and generic skills should be stressed. Benefits of adult education have to be credible and participants' expectations realistic. Otherwise more damage than good will be done to the image of adult education.

KNOWLEDGE OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

Knowledge of local opportunities, of providers of education and training and of distance learning opportunities was generally poor. Further education colleges were the best known providers.

Policy Implication: Providers of adult education and training need to re-think their marketing strategies.

Policy Implication: There is an urgent need for the advertising of distance learning opportunities, given both the lack of knowledge about them and the unpopularity of correspondence courses as a type of provision.

Policy Implication: There needs to be more stress on the diversity of courses available. People's image of adult education as consisting mainly of twilight classes at the local further education college needs to be changed.

Policy Implication: Further education colleges seem to have been most successful in advertising their existence. They should explore ways in which they can improve on this.

FUTURE DEMAND

We stressed in Chapter 4 that interest in returning to classes in the future was expressed by only 35% of our sample. We hope that action arising from some of the policy implications made above

will increase this figure. In this section we confine ourselves to the implications for kinds of provision.

Policy Implication: A variety of courses in terms of subject matter should be provided. There is a demand for both vocational and personal interest courses.

Policy Implication: There is particular interest in part-time courses, especially evening classes.

Policy Implication: Although evening classes were the most popular, part-time day courses are also particularly attractive to women.

Policy Implication: Courses which lead to certification will be attractive.

Conclusion: a brief comment on contextual factors

There is a danger that in looking at particular policy implications more general factors concerning adult education and training are overlooked. We end, therefore, with a brief reminder about the context in which this research was undertaken.

The most important point to make is that the continuing education and training of adults has emerged as a policy concern only in the recent past. Adult education has long been the Cinderella of the education world, both in terms of priorities for resources and in terms of public image. It is hardly surprising in these circumstances that interest in participation is low. As we indicated in Chapter 3, better marketing and publicity is not the magic answer to problems of low rates of participation. However, the extent of ignorance about the scope of opportunities available, particularly about distance learning, can do nothing to enhance participation rates. Indeed it would be interesting to repeat our survey on knowledge of opportunities and on future intentions after a concerted advertising campaign. We might establish if any non-returners were transformed into returners as a consequence.

The need is for a change in general societal attitudes to the value of education and training for adults throughout society in general. This is at the heart of almost all of our policy implications. Clearly a start is being made through government sponsoring of PICKUP, the creation of the Open College, RESTART and Action Plan in Scotland. Most recently, indeed, the government has coordinated its various schemes for the unemployed into what one hopes will be a coherent training programme. There is a great deal still to do. Adult education and training needs a high positive profile in order to encourage greater participation.

REFERENCES

ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR ADULT AND CONTINUING EDUCATION (ACACE) (1982), *Adults: their educational experience and needs*, Leicester: ACACE.

ANDERSON, R. and DARKENWALD, G. (1979), 'Participation and persistence in American adult education', *College Entrance Examination Board*, New York, p5–6.

ASLANIAN, C. and BRICKELL, H. (1980), 'Americans in transition: life changes as reasons for adult learning', *College Entrance Examination Board*, New York.

BRYANT, I. and TITMUS, C. (1981) *Paid Educational Leave in Scotland*, Glasgow: Department of Adult and Continuing Education, University of Glasgow.

COSGROVE, D. (1984) 'Education needs of employers and professional bodies' in COSGROVE, D. and McCONNELL, C. (eds) *Post 16 Developments in Continuing Education in Scotland in the 1980s*, Dundee: Dundee College of Education.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES COMMISSION (EOC) (1987) *Men's jobs, women's jobs*, London: HMSO.

HAMILTON, D. (1987), 'What is a vocational curriculum?' Paper presented at the annual conference of the British Educational Research Association, Manchester.

HART, M. (1984), 'Variables affecting adult learning projects', *Adult Education*, 54, 4, January.

HOROBIN, J. C., BRANSCOMBE, M. E. and EVETTS, R. D. A. (1987), *Mature Students in Higher Education*, Edinburgh: Scottish Institute of Adult and Continuing Education.

HOULE, C. (1979), *Motivation and Participation, Learning Opportunities for Adults*, Paris: OECD.

JONES, H. A. and WILLIAMS, K. E. (1979), *Adult Students and Higher Education*, Leicester: ACACE, (Occasional papers 3).

MacDONALD, C. (1983), *Mature Students in Higher and Further Education*, Scottish Adult Education Monographs: No. 2, University of Glasgow, Department of Adult and Continuing Education.

McINTOSH, N. E. *et al* (1976), *A Degree of Difference: a study of the first year's intake of students to Open University of UK*, Society for Research in Higher Education, Research in Higher Education Monographs 26, University of Surrey, Guildford.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ADULT EDUCATION (NIAE) (1970), *Adequacy of Provision*, Leicester: NIAE.

NORRIS, C. (1985) 'Towards a theory of participation in adult education', *Adult Education*, 58, 2, September pp122–126.

OSBORN, M., CHARNLEY, A. and WITHNALL, A. (1984), *Review of Existing Research in Adult and Continuing Education: Vol 1 (Revised): Mature Students*, Leicester: NIACE.

PHILLIPS, C. J. (1986) 'Full-time mature students in higher education: a survey of their characteristics, experiences and expectations', *British Educational Research Journal*, 12, 3, pp289–308.

SED (1986), 'Staying-on Rates', *Statistical Bulletin*, No. 9/C6/1986 December.

SQUIRES, G. (1981), *Higher Education and Working Life: review of studies in the UK*, Paris: OECD.

TIGHT, M. (ed) (1983), *Opportunities for Adult Education*, Croom Helm.

TOUGH, A. (1971), *The Adult's Learning Projects; a fresh approach to theory and practice in adult learning*, Toronto, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

TOUGH, A. (1985), *Adult Learning Projects: principles and strategies*, Learning concept US.

TRADE UNION CONGRESS (TUC) (1987), *The Education and Training of Girls and Women*, TUC.

UNESCO (1987) *Jobs for Women*, UNESCO.

Appendix A: Survey Questionnaire

SECTION A of the questionnaire concerned respondent... voting intentions as part of System Three's monthly omnibus survey. System Three also collect routine personal characteristics data. The questions on these are not included.

SECTION B - ASK ALL AGED 30 AND OVER

I'd like to ask you some questions about education and training. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions. We are interested in your opinions, whether you have done any further education and training or not.

B.1 Can you cast your mind back to when you left school. Within the 2 years after you left school, did you do any full-time study or courses which lasted for 9 months or more? (16)

Yes	1
No	2
(Don't know)	Y

IF 'YES', ASK B.2
IF 'NO' OR 'DON'T KNOW', SKIP TO B.5

B.2 Within the 2 years of finishing that course, did you take any subsequent full-time courses which lasted for nine months or more? (17)

Yes	1
No	2
(Don't know)	Y

REPEAT THIS QUESTION UNTIL YOU GET THE ANSWER 'NO', THEN GO TO B.3

B.3 Did you finish that last course you mentioned before 1985? (18)

Yes	1
No	2
Still doing course	3
Don't know	Y

IF 'YES', OR 'DON'T KNOW' GO TO B.4
IF 'NO' OR 'STILL DOING COURSE', GO TO NEXT SECTION

B.4 How old were you when you finished the last course you mentioned?

WRITE IN AGE..... THEN ADD 2 YEARS =

IF TOTAL = LESS THAN 20, WRITE IN '20'

USE THIS AGE AT ALL LATER QUESTIONS.
NOW SKIP TO B.6

Age finished last course:

	(19)
15 or under	1
16	2
17	3
18	4
19	5
20	6
21	7
22	8
23	9
24 or over	0

B.5 How old were you when you left school?

WRITE IN AGE..... THEN ADD 2 YEARS =

IF TOTAL = LESS THAN 20, WRITE IN '20'

USE THIS AGE AT ALL LATER QUESTIONS

Age left school:

	(20)
14 or under	1
15	2
16	3
17	4
18	5
19 or over	6

READ OUT :

I would like to ask you some questions about any education and training you have done since the age of (AGE IN BOX AT B.4/B.5) It doesn't matter whether it was at work, college, home or elsewhere, or whether it was full-time, part-time or in the evenings.

B.6 Since the age of (FROM B.4/B.5) until now, have you done any kind of study or training or attended any classes including hobbies or personal interest classes?

	(21)
Yes	1
No	2
(Don't know)	Y

IF 'YES', GO TO B.7
IF 'NO' OR 'DON'T KNOW', SKIP TO B.16

B.7 Did the time you spent on any of these classes, study or training last in total for 7 hours or more? These 7 hours or more should fall within 3 consecutive months.

	(22)
Yes	1
No	2
(Don't know)	Y

IF 'YES', GO TO B.8
IF 'NO' OR 'DON'T KNOW', SKIP TO B.16

B.8 Which is the most recent class, study or training that you've done, lasting 7 hours or more?
WRITE IN FULL DETAILS . SPECIFY SUBJECT

(23)

.....

(24)

.....

.....

.....

B.9 SHOW CARD (35)
Was that course.....?

Full-time	1
Sandwich/block release	2
Part-time during the day	3
Day release (from work)	4
Evening class	5
A correspondence course studied at home	6
Other (SPECIFY)	7
.....	
(Don't know)	Y

B.10 SHOW CARD (36)
How long did/will you take part?

Less than 4 weeks	1
Between 4 weeks and 10 weeks	2
11 weeks - under 6 months	3
6 months - 1 year	4
More than a year	5
(Don't know)	Y

B.11 Did it/will it result in any kind of certificate (for example a swimming certificate, an 'O' grade, City and Guilds, HND etc)? (37)

Yes	1
No	2
Don't know	Y

(CODE "ATTENDANCE CERTIFICATE ONLY" AS 'NO')

B.12 SHOW CARD (38)
How was the class, study or training paid for?

MULTI-CODING ALLOWED

By me	1
By spouse/parents/other family members	2
By employer	3
By Scottish Education Dept. (SED)	4
By Manpower Services Commission(MSC)	5
By other government agency	6
Local authority grant/bursary	7
Some other means	8
It was free	9
Don't know	Y

B.13 SHOW CARD (39)
Was this class, study or training related to any of these?
You may choose more than one.

The job you were doing then	1
A job you hoped to get	2
Personal interests or hobbies	3
Increasing your qualifications	4
Unwaged with work (housework/voluntary etc)	5
Other	X
Don't know	Y

B.14 SHOW CARDS. ENSURE RESPONDENT LOOKS AT BOTH

On these two cards are some reasons people have given for doing classes, study or training once they have left school, college or university. Which of these reasons apply to the last course you mentioned? PROBE Any others?

B.15 SHOW CARDS

Which of these reasons is the most important one? SINGLE CODE ONLY

	B.14 Any reasons	B.15 Most imp.		B.14 Any reasons	B.15 Most imp.
	(30)	(31)		(32)	(33)
Interested in studying/taking classes	1	1	Didn't involve too much travelling	1	1
Enjoyed time at school etc/ wanted to do classes	2	2	Felt I could afford it	2	2
Learn a lot from classes/studying	3	3	Wanted to improve qualifications	3	3
Thought it would be useful to me	4	4	Saw advertised/heard about/ know someone	4	4
Thought it might help me financially	5	5	Suitable course in the area	5	5
Thought it might help me in my job	6	6	Family encouraged me	6	6
Thought it might help me find a job	7	7	Employer suggested it	7	7
Have friends/family who go to classes	8	8	Subject interested me	8	8
Felt I had the time for it	9	9	Gave me something to do	9	9
			Other	X	X
			Don't know	Y	Y

NOW SKIP TO B.19

B.16 Since the age of (AGE AT B.4/B.5), have you ever made enquiries or asked for information about any personal interest classes, study or training courses?

	(34)
Yes	1
No	2
(Don't know)	Y

B.17 SHOW CARDS. ENSURE RESPONDENT LOOKS AT BOTH

On these two cards are some of the reasons people have given for not having done any classes, study or training since they left school, college or university. Which of these reasons apply to you? PROBE Any others?

B.18 SHOW CARDS

Which of these reasons is the most important one? SINGLE CODE ONLY

	B.17 Any reasons	B.18 Most imp.		B.17 Any reasons	B.18 Most imp.
	(35)	(36)		(37)	(38)
Not really interested in studying/ courses	1	1	Couldn't afford to	1	1
Time at school put me off studying	2	2	Didn't know how to find out what classes	2	2
Learn more from life than from studying	3	3	Didn't know sort of classes like to do	3	3
Courses aren't useful to me	4	4	No suitable course in the area	4	4
Studying wouldn't help financially	5	5	Have to look after children/ dependents	5	5
No point/wouldn't help in job	6	6	Husband/wife doesn't want me to	6	6
No point/wouldn't help find a job	7	7	Employer didn't want me to do	7	7
Studying not for people like me	8	8	Being physically disabled makes it difficult	8	8
None of friends/family go to classes/study	9	9	Having medical problem makes if difficult	9	9
Studying would make me dissatisfied with my life	0	0	Don't have qualifications to apply	0	0
Haven't got the time	X	X	Did apply/wasn't offered place	X	X
Too much travelling involved	Y	Y	Other (SPECIFY)	Y	Y

62

B.19 Are there any classes, studying or training courses that you would like to do in future, if they were available? For example, to learn more about a hobby or personal interest or to help you with your present or possible future employment? (39)

Yes 1
No 2
(Don't know) Y

IF 'YES', GO TO B.20
IF 'NO' OR 'DON'T KNOW', SKIP TO B.24

B.20a) What classes, study or training courses would you like to do? (40)
PROBE Any others? WRITE IN SPECIFY SUBJECT

.....

.....

..... (41)

.....

b) SHOW CARD (42)
For each one you've mentioned, are they related to any of these? If you feel that a course is related to more than one of these, please say.

The job you are doing now 1
A job you hope to get 2
Personal interests or hobbies 3
Increasing your qualifications 4
Unwaged work (Housework/ voluntary etc) 5
Other X
Don't know Y

IF ONLY ONE COURSE MENTIONED AT B.20 a), SKIP TO B.22

B.21 Which one of these classes, study or training courses that you mentioned would you most like to do? WRITE IN DETAILS OF ONE COURSE ONLY (43)

..... (44)

B.22 SHOW CARD (45)
Would you prefer this course to be.....

Full time 1
Sandwich/block release 2
Part-time during the day 3
Day release (from work) 4
In the evening 5
A correspondence course 6
Other 7
Don't know Y

B.23 Would this class, study or training course you are most interested in result immediately in any kind of certificate (for instance, a swimming certificate, an 'O' grade, City and Guilds, HND etc)? (46)

Yes 1
No 2
Don't mind 3
Don't know Y

(CODE "ATTENDANCE CERTIFICATE ONLY" AS 'NO')

B.34 Are there any classes, study or training opportunities for adults in your local area? (47)

Yes	1
No	2
Don't know	Y

B.35 Are there any classes, study or training opportunities open to adults which someone could do totally from home? (48)

Yes	1
No	2
Don't know	Y

B.36 Who provides or promotes classes, study or training opportunities for adults? (49)

PROBE Any others? DO NOT PROMPT

IF IN DOUBT HOW TO CODE WRITE IN FULL DETAILS

Adult Basic Education Centre	1
Community education	2
Further education college/ other college	3
Government/Manpower Services Commission	4
Industrial Training Board	5
Local authority/council/ regional council	6
Open university	7
Open College/Open Tech	8
Place of work	9
Private providers	0
	(50)
Professional Association	1
School	2
Sports centre	3
Trade union	4
Women's Rural Institute/ Townswomen's Guild	5
Workers Educational Assoc. (WEA)	6
University Extra-Mural/ Adult Education Department	7
Other (SPECIFY)	8
.....	
There aren't any	0
Don't know	Y

B.37 SHOW CARD (51)
What are your main leisure time interests and activities?
PROBE Any others?

Just passing the time	1
Cinema/theatre	2
Collecting e.g. stamps etc	3
Gardening	4
Handicrafts/woodwork/sewing/DIY	5
Indoor games (including darts etc)	6
Playing a musical instrument	7
Political/trade union activities	8
Reading	9
Social activities	0
	(52)
Physical sports	1
Television/radio/listening to music	2
Voluntary/committee work	3
Watching sports	4
Other (SPECIFY)	5
.....	
Little or no leisure time	0
None	X
Don't know	Y

B.28 SHOW CARD
Which, if any, of the formal education or work qualifications on this card have you obtained?
CODE HIGHEST NUMBER CODE ONLY

	(53)
None	1
ONC/OND/City & Guilds/SNC/Scotvec	2
1 - 4 'O' Levels/CSE/Lower or Junior Leaving Cert.	3
5 or more 'O' Levels/Secretarial/RSA	4
Full industrial apprenticeship	5
Intermediate Arts or Science/HGN/SRN/Professional Institute intermediate examination	6
Highers/'A' Levels/CSYS/Higher or Senior Leaving Cert.	7
Professional Institute final examination/ Teachers Training Certificate/Non-degree professional	8
HNC/HND/Degree/Higher degree	9
Other (SPECIFY)	
.....	X
Don't know	Y

ASK ALL
These questions were asked on behalf of the Scottish Council for Research in Education. They would be very interested in talking to you again. Would it be alright if they got in touch with you either by phone or by letter in the future?

Yes	1
No	2

WRITE IN ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Appendix B:
Scottish Opinion Survey – Sample Profile (weighted)

BASE: ALL AGED 15 AND OVER

	TOTAL	AGE 15-24	AGE 25-34	AGE 35-44	AGE 45-54	AGE 55+	SEX MALE	SEX FEMALE	CLASS AB	CLASS C1	CLASS C2	CLASS DE	MARITAL STATUS MARRIED	MARITAL STATUS NOT MARRIED	WORKING STATUS WORK	WORKING STATUS NOT WORK	CHILDREN AGED 15 OR UNDER ANY	CHILDREN AGED 15 OR UNDER NONE
Total (unweighted)	1039	207	197	199	210	162	493	511	238	310	313	272	537	367	1000	573	317	1073
(weighted)	1041	251	171	212	208	244	476	565	166	260	243	343	613	413	1026	453	245	1026
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
AGE																		
15-17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
18-24	261	261	0	0	0	0	139	121	15	63	63	98	93	173	155	107	84	166
	14%	100%	-	-	-	-	14%	12%	7%	14%	14%	19%	9%	28%	14%	11%	14%	17%
25-34	371	0	371	0	0	0	160	210	65	73	115	118	277	94	281	150	167	194
	20%	-	100%	-	-	-	19%	21%	28%	20%	21%	17%	22%	15%	24%	16%	41%	14%
35-44	313	0	0	312	0	0	138	175	39	68	118	77	267	76	213	98	218	94
	17%	-	-	100%	-	-	16%	17%	16%	17%	21%	12%	21%	7%	20%	10%	22%	9%
45-54	288	0	0	0	288	0	172	116	55	55	104	81	250	75	265	68	61	292
	16%	-	-	-	100%	-	18%	15%	17%	15%	19%	12%	20%	7%	22%	9%	12%	19%
55-64	258	0	0	0	0	258	195	193	93	56	77	111	205	67	179	166	11	365
	15%	-	-	-	-	100%	16%	15%	17%	14%	17%	17%	18%	11%	15%	18%	2%	35%
65+	351	0	0	0	0	351	155	196	51	69	97	185	106	185	19	332	1	350
	19%	-	-	-	-	56%	14%	20%	14%	18%	18%	36%	11%	30%	2%	58%	*	34%
SEX																		
Male	979	139	100	138	142	299	979	0	155	195	213	284	515	264	587	292	261	618
	47%	53%	58%	64%	68%	46%	100%	-	93%	75%	88%	83%	84%	64%	57%	64%	106%	60%
Female (housewife)	991	67	135	172	145	343	0	991	185	167	241	373	637	301	308	533	359	568
	50%	34%	52%	55%	32%	53%	-	94%	97%	64%	95%	57%	50%	80%	30%	47%	57%	55%
Female (not housewife)	91	39	16	3	5	3	0	61	6	19	21	19	16	76	93	18	17	74
	5%	19%	10%	1%	2%	1%	-	6%	3%	7%	8%	3%	1%	7%	9%	2%	3%	7%
SIZE OF HOUSEHOLD																		
1 person	306	35	29	10	21	217	116	190	16	68	39	153	0	300	99	217	0	306
	16%	11%	9%	3%	7%	34%	13%	19%	17%	17%	7%	23%	-	49%	16%	23%	-	29%
2 persons	591	57	65	86	75	308	238	269	95	117	139	217	436	187	287	307	74	540
	30%	23%	19%	13%	26%	51%	34%	27%	31%	36%	26%	38%	34%	21%	28%	35%	7%	51%
3 persons	385	91	85	74	67	69	167	219	55	67	123	126	291	95	267	179	182	203
	20%	31%	25%	17%	16%	11%	19%	22%	17%	21%	23%	19%	23%	11%	26%	19%	28%	17%
4 persons	419	69	127	127	73	23	198	216	71	84	151	108	362	62	264	193	201	199
	22%	25%	34%	41%	24%	4%	22%	22%	24%	22%	28%	16%	28%	10%	24%	18%	31%	11%
5+ persons	212	25	36	69	38	9	102	110	25	36	68	36	183	25	140	72	188	48
	11%	7%	14%	27%	13%	1%	12%	11%	10%	10%	16%	5%	14%	3%	13%	8%	26%	4%

Appendix C:
Scottish Opinion Survey – Sample Profile (unweighted)

BASE: ALL AGES 20 AND OVER

	TOTAL	AGE					SEX		CLASS				MARITAL STATUS		WORKING STATUS		CHILDREN AGED 14 OR	
		20-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55+	MALE	FEMALE	AB	C1	C2	DE	MARRIED -1ST	NOT MARRIED -1ST	WORK -14HR	NOT WORK -14HR	ANY	NONE
TOTAL	1000 100%	207 100%	320 100%	195 100%	203 100%	195 100%	483 100%	513 100%	205 100%	310 100%	318 100%	173 100%	1003 100%	397 100%	1020 100%	673 100%	617 100%	1073 100%
AGE																		
15-17	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -
18-29	207 21%	207 100%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	110 23%	96 19%	15 7%	55 18%	56 18%	65 38%	95 9%	112 28%	101 10%	96 14%	75 12%	131 12%
25-34	320 32%	0 -	320 100%	0 -	0 -	0 -	206 43%	206 40%	31 15%	117 38%	105 33%	171 24%	267 27%	127 32%	211 21%	213 32%	123 20%	193 18%
35-44	195 20%	0 -	0 -	195 100%	0 -	0 -	105 22%	253 24%	25 24%	85 27%	105 33%	117 17%	257 26%	65 16%	206 20%	107 16%	261 42%	105 10%
45-54	203 20%	0 -	0 -	0 -	203 100%	0 -	105 22%	108 21%	55 27%	57 18%	65 20%	65 38%	223 22%	71 18%	188 18%	63 9%	96 16%	212 20%
55-64	219 11%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	216 97%	107 22%	109 21%	35 17%	13 4%	30 9%	85 13%	105 10%	95 24%	91 9%	125 19%	9 1%	209 19%
65+	256 13%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	256 100%	100 21%	137 27%	29 14%	13 4%	25 8%	105 26%	115 11%	131 33%	13 1%	239 37%	1 *	253 24%
SEX																		
Male	483 47%	112 54%	200 44%	105 53%	132 65%	215 97%	483 100%	0 -	111 54%	200 65%	163 51%	275 61%	535 47%	453 114%	531 52%	253 38%	325 53%	560 52%
Female (housewife)	453 53%	69 33%	121 53%	208 35%	135 41%	299 53%	0 -	453 94%	112 54%	109 35%	153 48%	180 39%	501 51%	173 44%	314 31%	603 70%	172 28%	478 44%
Female (not housewife)	60 3%	26 13%	29 1%	1 1%	5 2%	2 *	0 -	60 12%	9 3%	15 1%	17 5%	15 3%	19 1%	11 3%	15 1%	18 3%	19 3%	11 1%
SIZE OF HOUSEHOLD																		
1 person	251 13%	28 14%	39 12%	15 3%	20 7%	133 34%	106 12%	145 14%	11 14%	57 14%	29 9%	104 15%	1 *	257 14%	95 9%	156 13%	0 -	251 23%
2 persons	500 24%	45 22%	38 11%	54 13%	93 24%	269 51%	256 34%	250 27%	27 24%	113 27%	113 33%	199 24%	373 34%	135 31%	233 23%	241 34%	36 1%	372 14%
3 persons	403 21%	65 31%	139 24%	75 18%	80 24%	55 11%	147 19%	256 25%	35 14%	91 23%	113 33%	151 21%	305 29%	103 18%	220 22%	183 21%	217 37%	186 17%
4 persons	407 20%	36 24%	173 34%	175 43%	67 20%	17 1%	225 29%	262 30%	85 24%	106 34%	100 31%	135 20%	318 30%	89 23%	263 26%	175 23%	259 44%	158 15%
5+ persons	255 13%	13 6%	61 19%	115 29%	34 10%	7 2%	119 15%	136 13%	35 17%	48 15%	36 11%	75 11%	207 17%	48 12%	107 11%	98 15%	211 34%	44 4%

Recurrent education and training are seen as vital to sustaining economic growth. Yet little is known about the extent of participation in education and training among the general adult population. This book reports the findings from a survey of 2,000 adults on their attitudes towards returning to education and training. It identifies differences between returners and non-returners and highlights factors affecting participation. The book also includes findings on how well informed adults are about the opportunities available to them. A major strength of the book is that the policy implications of the survey are drawn out, chapter by chapter, and are then summarised in the final chapter.

SCOTTISH COUNCIL FOR RESEARCH IN EDUCATION